

THE REMARKS

Claims 1-45 were pending prior to entering the amendments.

The Amendments

Independent claims 1, 10, 27, and 39 have been amended. Dependent claims 3, 7, 23, 25, 36, 38 and 43 have been amended.

No new matter is introduced in any of the above amendments. The Examiner is requested to enter the amendment and re-consider the application.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 12-16, 18, 21, 22, 24, 39-42, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Stewart (U.S. Patent 6,732,176). In response, applicants have amended claims 1, 10, and 39. and respectfully submits that claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 12-16, 18, 21, 22, 24, 39-42, and 45 are patentable over Stewart.

Independent Claim 1

Amended claim 1 recites,

“A method of controlling access to a network, comprising:

requesting an identity from a client attempting to connect to the network;

receiving the identity;

associating location information with the identity;

authenticating the identity;

comparing the location information against a policy designating locations, if any, at which the client is permitted to connect to the network;

deciding whether to grant or deny the client access to the network based on the authenticity of the identity and the comparison of the location information;

wherein if the client is granted access to the network, and subsequently moves to a new location, the network follows a procedure to either re-authenticate or not re-authenticate the client; and

wherein if, pursuant to the procedure, the client continues to have access to the network after moving to the new location, the client's access at the new location will be based on policies of the new location"

Stewart does not disclose a method for authentication if the client is connected to the network, and subsequently moves to a new location on that network.

The Applicants describe procedures if the client changes their location after initially authenticating and connecting with a network. Multiple embodiments are discussed related to a decision to re-authenticate on the same network and the decision of applying policies [Parker pg.12 ln 21, pg. 13, ln 15]. Stewart does not discuss re-authentication or other elements related to changing the client's location.

Therefore, Applicants assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Stewart.

Independent Claim 10 and 39

Claims 10 and 39 are apparatus claims, which include similar limitations as claim 1. Because of the similarities between claim 1, 10 and 39, Applicants assert that the remarks provided above in regard to claim 1 also apply to claims 10 and 39. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 10 and 39 are not anticipated by Kohn.

Dependent Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 12-16, 18, 21, 22, 24, 40-42, and 45

Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 12-16, 18, 21, 22, 24, 40-42, and 45 are directly dependent on amended claims 1, 10 or 39. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2, 4-6, 9, 12-16, 18, 21, 22, 24, 40-42, and 45 are allowable at least based on an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

Claims 3, 11, 20, 23, 27-29, 31, and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Kwan (U.S. Patent application Publication 2004/0255154).

Claims 7, 19, 25, 26, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Lor (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0068668).

Claims 8, 17, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Liming (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0055924).

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Kwan, further in view of Liming.

Claims 32 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Kwan, further in view of Lor.

In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 27 and dependent claims 3, 7, 23, 25, 36, 38, and 43.

Independent claim 27

Claim 27 has been amended to include elements for authentication by the network server if the client is connected to the network, and subsequently moves to a new location. These are the same elements that were added to claims 1. As previously noted, these limitations are not disclosed by Stewart. Further, the limitations are not disclosed by Kwan. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 27 is non-obvious and is an allowable claim.

Dependent Claims 3, 23, 36

Claims 3, 23 and 36 are dependent upon claims 1, 10 and 27, respectively. Since claims 1, 10 and 27 are allowable claims, claims 3, 23, and 36 are allowable at least based upon an allowable claim base. However, claims 3, 23 and 36 have been amended to include additional elements related to the Radius server, as disclosed in the Applicant's specification. [Parker pg. 11 In 13-30] These elements are not disclosed in Stewart, Kwan, Lor, or Liming. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3, 23, and 36 are allowable claims.

Dependent Claims 7, 25 38 and 43

Claims 7, 25 38 and 43 are dependent upon claims 1, 10, 27, and 39, respectively. Since claims 1, 10, 27, and 39 are allowable claims, claims 7, 25 38 and 43 are allowable at least based upon an allowable claim base. However, claims 3, 23 and 36 have been amended to limit the authentication mechanism to the MD5 protocol for authenticating an identity. [Parker pg.11 ln 1, pg.12 ln 1-2] Neither Stewart, Kwan, Lor, or Liming disclose the use of the MD5 protocol. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 7, 25 38 and 43 are allowable claims.

Dependent Claims 8, 11, 17, 19-20, 26, 28-35, 37 and 44

Claims 8, 11, 17, 19-20, 26, 28-35, 37 and 44 are directly or indirectly dependent on amended claims 1, 10, 27 or 39. Applicant respectfully asserts that these claims are allowable at least based on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the application is now in good and proper condition for allowance. Early notification of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 30, 2008

/Donald R. Gibson/
Donald R. Gibson
Reg No. 59,564

HOWREY LLP
2941 Fairview Park Drive, Box 7
Falls Church, VA 22042
Tel: (650) 798-3570
Fax: (650) 798-3600